



An  
Coimisiún  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report

### ACP-322949-25

---

<b>Development</b>	Conversion of attic to a room with dormer extension and associated works.
<b>Location</b>	16 Castle Village Rise, Celbridge, Co. Kildare
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Kildare County Council
<b>Planning Authority Reg. Ref.</b>	2461220
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Derek and Emily Keenan.
<b>Type of Application</b>	Permission
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Grant Permission
<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Third Party
<b>Appellant(s)</b>	Dragana and Domagoj Vodomin.
<b>Observer(s)</b>	None
<b>Date of Site Inspection</b>	27/2/26
<b>Inspector</b>	Ronan Murphy

## **1.0 Site Location and Description**

- 1.1. The subject site is located within the Castle Village housing estate in Celbridge. The site has a stated total area of 0.038ha and is approx. 1.6km from Celbridge Town Centre.
- 1.2. The appeal site comprises of an existing two storey semi-detached dwelling with a garden to the rear which includes two small sheds.
- 1.3. The appeal site is primarily bounded to the north by No.15 Castle Village Rise to the east, No. 17 Caste Village Rise to the west and the back gardens of houses fronting Ballygoran View to the south.

## **2.0 Proposed Development**

- 2.1. Planning permission is sought for the conversion of attic into a room with dormer extension and associated works.
- 2.2. The plans submitted with the application show that the proposed room would have an internal floor area of 24m<sup>2</sup> and the proposed would have an internal height of c. 2.2m.
- 2.3. The application also proposes a dormer window which would have an external width of c. 4m and an external height of c. 2.0m. The proposed dormer would be set in c. 900mm from the shared eastern boundary of the land and c. 1.08m from the western side of the dwelling.

## **3.0 Planning Authority Decision**

### **3.1. Decision**

- 3.1.1 By order dated 9/6/25 the Planning Authority granted planning permission, subject to 8 conditions. Condition 2 required that the height of the proposed dormer extension shall be reduced below that of the ridge height of the existing roof and the internal width of the proposed dormer extension shall be reduced by 0.7m, from 3.7m to 3m.

### 3.2. Planning Authority Reports

#### Planning Reports

3.2.1 There are three planning report on file. The first planning report dated 9/1/25 outlines that while the development is acceptable in principle, there are concerns with respect to scale of the dormer and the potential impact of the dormer on the residential amenity of the property to the rear by way of overlooking. Further information was requested on this basis.

#### 3.2.2 Other Technical Reports

**MD Engineer:** Report dated 20/11/24 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.

**Water Services:** Report dated 21/11/24 outlining no objections, subject to conditions.

**Environment:** Report dated 12/12/24 outlining no objection, subject to conditions.

**Fire Services:** Report dated 16/12/24 outlining no objection.

3.2.3 A further information response was received on 8/4/25 comprising of:

- A cover letter from Des Maguire Architects

#### *Second planning report*

3.2.4 A second planning report dated 30/4/25 outlines concern that the applicant has not addressed the matters raised by the Planning Authority in Item 1 of the further information requested on the 20/01/2025. A request for clarification of Further Information was requested on this basis.

3.2.5 A response to the Clarification of Further Information request was received on 13/5/25 comprising of:

- A cover letter from Des Maguire Architects.

#### *Third planning report*

3.2.6 A third planning report dated 30/5/25 outlines that the Planning Authority remain concerned with the proposed scale and bulk of the proposed dormer and that as a result of the applicant twice being afforded the opportunity to reduce its scale and bulk and declining to do so, the Planning Authority would attach conditions which reduce its height and width. Permission was recommended on this basis.

### 3.3. Prescribed Bodies

3.3.1 None of file.

### 3.4. Third Party Observations

3.4.1 None on file

## 4.0 Planning History

4.1 There is no planning history on the appeal site.

## 5.0 Policy Context

### 5.1 Development Plan

*Celbridge Local Area Plan 2017-2023*

5.1.1 The subject site is zoned B – Existing Residential / Infill under the *Celbridge Local Area Plan 2017-2023 (expired)* with the stated objective “To protect and enhance the amenity of established residential communities and promote sustainable intensification.”

5.1.2 I note that the planning authority’s website indicates that Kildare County Council will have regard to this plan until such time as it is reviewed or another plan is made.

5.1.3 Dwelling is permitted in principle in the zoning matrix.

*Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029*

5.1.4 Development management standards for developments such as that proposed are included in Chapter 15 of the *Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029*.

5.1.5 Section 15.4.12 relates to extensions to dwellings and states *that adapting residential units through extensions can sustainably accommodate the changing needs of occupants subject to the protection of residential and visual amenities. A well-designed extension can provide extra space, personalise and enhance the appearance of a dwelling.* In addition to this it is stated that *it would not be practical to set out a prescriptive approach to the design of extensions that would cover every situation.*

5.1.6 A number of basic principles are outlined including:

- The extension shall have regard to the form and scale of the existing dwelling and should not adversely distort the scale or mass of the structure.
- The extension should not provide for new overlooking or loss of privacy below reasonable levels to the private area of an adjacent residence.
- New extensions should not overshadow adjacent dwellings to the degree that there is a significant decrease in daylight or sunlight entering into the house.

## **5.2 Natural Heritage Designations**

5.2.1 The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 site(s) or Natural Heritage Area(s). The Rye Water Valley/Carlton SAC (Site Code: 001398) is located c. 2.96km to the north of the site. In addition to this, the Royal Canal pNHA (Site Code: 002103) is located c. 2.94m to the north of the site.

5.2.2 A screening exercise for Appropriate Assessment will be undertaken in Section 8 below.

## **5.3 EIA Screening**

5.3.1 See completed Form 2 attached by way of appendix to this report. Having regard to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development and to the criteria set out in Schedule 7 of the Regulations, I have concluded at preliminary examination that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment arising from the proposed development. EIA, therefore, is not required.

## **5.4 Water Framework Directive**

5.4.1 The purpose of the EU Water Framework Directive is an initiative aimed at improving water quality throughout the European Union. The Directive was adopted in 2000 and requires governments to take a new approach to managing all their waters; rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs, groundwater, protected areas (including wetlands and other water dependent ecosystems), estuaries (transitional) and coastal waters.

5.4.2 An Coimisiún Pleanála and other statutory authorities cannot grant development consent where a proposed development would give rise to a reduction in water quality.

5.4.3 The LIFFEY\_150 (IE\_EA\_09L011900) river waterbody is c.324m to the north of the appeal site. This waterbody is classified as moderate ecological status. This is illustrated on the EPA mapping (<https://gis.epa.ie/EPAMaps/>).

5.4.4 I have assessed the proposal and have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration. Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the project, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

5.4.5 The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The scale of the proposed development, and
- The fact that the site will be connected to the public foul sewer and stormwater infrastructure.

## 6.0 The Appeal

### 6.1. Grounds of Appeal

6.1.1 A third party appeal from Setanta Solicitors on behalf of Drangana and Domagoj Vodomin has been received. The third-party appeal includes a number of appendices. The appeal can be summarised as:

- The application form is not signed and is an online version of the application form. A digital login cannot satisfy the statutory obligation to sign the application form. Accordingly, the application is invalid. A similar issue was raised in ABP-322480-25.
- The breakdown of residential mix is not provided, and the newspaper name is incorrect.
- The initial planning report noted the internal height of the attic conversion and took cognisance of the overbearing nature of the proposed dormer and sought a reduction.

- In the second planning report the area planner was not satisfied that no reduction was proposed.
- The applicant's response to the Further Information request was in rather condescending language. The applicants assert that the proposed dormer does not extend to the location shown and submits that there is no overshadowing and no entitlement to access to the sun under Irish Law. The location of the proposed dormer would greatly impact sunlight of 15 Castle Village Rise.
- The dormer would extinguish half of the available sunlight of the appellants property. This is a substantial loss of light.
- The plans referred to in condition 1 are disappplied by condition 2 which require revised drawings prior to commencement of development.
- Condition 5 which requires that the space is not to be habitable, however, given the request for the dormer window this is clearly designed for habitable space. The Planning Authority is clearly on notice of the use for this, and the building and planning requirements are not met for this space to be used as a living space. A storage space would not require a window.
- The applicants are already trespassing on the appellants property. While it is accepted that the planning authority do not go into matters of title, it is clear trespass and any extension built in this wall greatly amplifies the trespass.
- The appellant requests that an appropriate screening should be carried out by the Coimisiún, that a site visit be carried out to examine the loss of light concerns and that the Coimisiún refuse permission.

## **6.2. Applicant Response**

6.2.1 Letter dated 24/7/25 outlining that permission was granted having regard to the modest nature of the request and precedent for similar works in the area. The original application was the least disruptive, expensive, and time-consuming option compared to other alternatives (such as a side extension) that would require complicated relocation of drainage and gas services. Kildare County Council made the correct decision in granting planning permission.

## **6.3 Planning Authority Response**

6.3.1 A response dated 9/7/25 was received from Kildare County Council. The response states that the Planning Authority confirms its decision and refers to the planning officers report and those of the various technical departments and prescribed bodies in relation to the assessment of this planning applications.

### 6.3. Observations

6.4.1 There are no observations on file.

### 6.4. Further Responses

6.5.1 There are no further responses on file.

## 7.0 Assessment

7.1. Having examined the appeal details and all other documentation on file, including the reports of the local authority and inspected the site. I consider that the substantive issues in this appeal to be considered are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Procedural issues
- Impact on Residential Amenity
- Flood Risk Management
- Appropriate Assessment

### 7.2. Principle of Development

7.2.1 Given the zoning of the land and the fact that the proposal comprises of an attic extension and dormer window of an existing two storey, semi-detached dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to a full assessment.

7.2.2 I make the Coimisiún aware that the *Celbridge Local Area Plan 2017-2023* was adopted in August 2017 and that this LAP has now expired. A planning authority is required to send notice of a proposal to make a new local area plan every six years after the making of the previous local area plan or they can publish a notice to extend the period of the plan for up to five years. No new local area plan has been made and there is no information available to indicate that the 2017 plan has been extended. The

process of making a new local area plan has not formally commenced and there is no draft local area plan. A statement on the Council's website states that the Council will continue to have regard to the 2017 local area plan until it is reviewed or another plan is made.

7.2.3 Section 18(3)(a) of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) states that the Board shall have regard to the provisions of any local area plan prepared for the area to which the application relates. It is unclear if the existing local area plan is still in force. In any case, for the purposes of considering this application, I consider that given the dwelling on the land, within an existing residential area, it is reasonable to note that the site is on lands zoned 'existing residential / infill.'

### **7.3 Procedural Issues**

7.3.1 The appellant notes that the application form has not been signed by the applicant and that a digital login cannot satisfy the statutory obligation to sign the application form. Accordingly, the application is invalid.

7.3.2 In the first instance, I note that the application was considered to be valid by the Planning Authority and I am satisfied that it is not the role of the Coimisiún to question the validity of the application. In this regard I note the Appeal Response received from the Local Authority does not raise any question in relation to the validity of the application or indeed any issue in respect of the information provided on the Online Portal. Similarly, the issue of the validity of the Planning Application or indeed issues with the Online Portal were not raised as part of either the Request for Further Information or Clarification of Further Information as issued.

7.3.3 I have considered the application form which was lodged with the initial application, and I agree that it was not signed by the applicant. However, I make the Coimisiún aware that a signed Cover Letter from the Agent was uploaded to the online portal. Both the Application Form and the cover letter are stamped received by the Local Authority on 19/11/24. The the online application form includes the following statement in Section 22: *'where an application is made in electronic form with the consent of the Planning Authority under article 22(3) of the Principal Regulations valid login credentials will replace the need for a signature and satisfy the declaration.* The Appellant considers the above Guidance to be in error and further considers Article 22

(3) is a generic statement which does not set aside for the application form to be signed but instead that the usual 6 no. copies are reduced to 1 copy.

7.3.4 I make the Coimisiún aware that I have considered the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) on the Local Government Online Planning Portal. Question 49 is pertinent in this case, and it states that *'when an application is made in electronic form with the consent of the Planning Authority under article 22(3) of the Principal Regulations, valid login credentials will replace the need for a signature and satisfy the declaration.'* Having considered this, in my view, the Applicant's login credentials are acceptable in the case of electronic planning applications, in place of the Applicant's signature on the online planning application form.

7.3.5 The appellant also highlights concern with respect to the Online Planning Portal which include the lack of a positive affirmation requirement when signing up to the online portal and a requirement that any unsigned statement would require the express consent of the planning authority. I again refer to the above guidance/ FAQ from the Local Government Online Portal wherein the login credentials of the Applicant replace the need for a signature. In addition to this, I note that the users creating an account are required to agree to terms when registering their account. Having considered this, in my view there is no express requirement for a 'positive affirmation' to which the Appellant refers. I have formed the opinion that valid login credentials replace the need for a signature as set out in Question 49 of the FAQ from the Local Government Online Portal and therefore I am satisfied that the Applicant has suitably complied with the requirements for the lodgement of a valid online application.

#### **7.4 Impact on Residential Amenity**

7.4.1 The third-party appeal outlines concerns that the proposed dormer would have an impact on the residential amenity of their property, specifically that the dormer would extinguish half of the available sunlight of the appellants property which would be a substantial loss of light.

7.4.2 Having considered the area planners reports, I note that the Planning Authority had concerns with respect to the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer which it was considered would lead to the negative impact on the visual and residential amenity of surrounding properties. The applicant was requested to reconsider the design of the proposed dormer by way of both Further Information and Clarification of Further

Information. On both occasions the applicant declined to alter the design of the proposed dormer for a number of reasons including precedent set by other dormers granted planning permission in County Kildare, the proposed development would not cause overshadowing of adjacent properties, the lack of specificity the revisions required by Kildare County Council and the fact that a reduction in the height of the dormer as proposed could negate any additional headroom sought by the planning application and as a result a dormer extension would not be worth pursuing.

7.4.3 The proposed dormer would have an external width of c. 4m and an external height of c. 2.0m and would be set in c. 900mm from the shared boundary with No.15 Castle Village Rise and (eastern boundary) and c. 1.08m from the western side of the dwelling.

7.4.4 I note that Section 15.4.12 of the *Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029* is generally supportive of adapting residential units through extensions. In my view the increase in floor area of the existing dwelling by way of an attic conversion and dormer would comply with Section 15.4.12 of the *Kildare County Development Plan 2023-2029*.

7.4.5 It is noted that Condition 2 of the notification of decision to grant permission by Kildare County Council requires that the height of the proposed dormer extension shall be reduced below that of the ridge height of the existing roof on the subject site and that the internal width of the proposed dormer extension shall be reduced by 0.7m, from 3.7m to 3m.

#### *Scale*

7.4.6 It is noted that concerns relating to the scale and bulk of the proposed dormer was a common theme throughout all three of the area planners report. Having considered the plans submitted with the application, in my view, the scale of the dormer relative to the existing property is excessive. I refer the Coimisiún to Drawing No. A-1 '*Existing and proposed*', while not shown on this drawing, I have measured the width of the existing roof and the proposed dormer and note that the existing roof has a width of c. 5.9m, and the proposed dormer has an external width of c.4.1m. In my view, the scale of the proposed dormer is excessive. In my opinion, a reduction in width of the dormer as envisaged by Condition 2 of the notification of decision to grant permission is appropriate in order to ensure that the scale and massing of the dormer is appropriate

to the scale of the property. However, I would recommend that the external width of the proposed dormer should be reduced to 3.5m.

7.4.7 In addition to this, I have concerns with the height of the proposed dormer. I refer the Coimisiún to Proposed Section A-A and *Proposed Side Elevation* drawings contained within Drawing No. A-1 '*Existing and Proposed*' which show that the proposed dormer would extend up to the ridge height of the existing dwelling. I have concerns that the dormer therefore could be viewed from the public realm (especially from the western side elevation). Therefore, I would recommend that the height of the proposed dormer extension should be reduced below that of the ridge height of the existing roof by at least 300mm. I note that this alteration would reduce the head height of dormer element of the proposed attic conversion. However, the head height of an attic conversion is a matter for Building Regulations and not a matter which can be dealt with by way of planning.

7.4.8 Having considered the foregoing; I am satisfied that these alterations would ensure that the scale of the dormer would successfully integrate with the existing dwelling. This matter could be dealt with by way of condition, should the Coimisiún be of a mind to grant planning permission.

#### *Overlooking*

7.4.9 In terms of impacts on residential amenity, I am of the opinion that levels of overlooking of adjoining properties are comparable with that existing within the wider area. Given the urban location of the site, a certain degree of overlooking is to be anticipated. I do not anticipate that impacts on privacy would be so great so as to warrant a refusal of permission.

#### *Overshadowing*

7.4.10 I note the concerns of the third-party with regard to overshadowing. Having been on site and considered the plans on file, I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would not cause undue overshadowing. I have come to this conclusion having regard to the north-south orientation of the site and the sun path, whereby the proposed dormer would not cast a shadow on the neighbouring property during the morning period. However, it is noted that there may be some shadows cast during the later afternoon and summer evenings. However, in my view, the proposed alterations to the scale of

the proposed dormer outlined above would successfully mitigate any concerns with respect to overshadowing.

7.4.9 In summary, I am satisfied that, subject to the reduction in width and height of the proposed dormer that the proposed works would not result in significant impacts on the residential amenity of surrounding properties. I am cognisant of the relationship of the proposed development to neighbouring properties, however, any impacts which may occur would be in line with what might be expected in an area such as this. This is an urban area and subject to the design alterations outlined above, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have an undue impact on surrounding residential amenity by way of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing development.

## **7.5 Flood Risk Management**

7.5.1 I have consulted the flood mapping system ([www.floodinfo.ie](http://www.floodinfo.ie)) and I note that the subject land is within Flood Zone 'C'.

7.5.2 Having considered the above, I consider the proposed development would not result increase the risk of flood either within the site itself or the surrounding area. The proposal is acceptable from a flood risk perspective.

## **8.0 AA Screening**

8.1. I have considered the proposed development in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The application is for an attic conversion and dormer extension to the rear of the dwelling at No. 16 Castle Village Rise, Celbridge, Co. Kildare.

8.2. The appeal site is not located on or within any designated Natura 2000 site(s) or Natural Heritage Area(s). The Rye Water Valley/Cartron SAC (Site Code: 001398) is located c. 2.96km to the north of the site. In addition to this, the Royal Canal pNHA (Site Code: 002103) is located c. 2.94m to the north of the site.

8.3. There is no hydrological link between the subject site and the European sites.

Having considered the nature, scale, and location of the proposed development, I am satisfied that it can be eliminated from further assessment because there is no conceivable risk to any European Site. The reason for this conclusion is as follows:

- The small scale and minor nature of the development
- The urban location in an existing residential area
- The distance to the nearest European site and lack of pathways between the development and the European Site.

8.4 I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development would not have a likely significant effect on any European Site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

8.5 Likely significant effects are excluded and therefore Appropriate Assessment (stage 2) (under Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000) is not required.

## 9.0 Recommendation

9.1. I recommend that planning permission be granted.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

10.1 Having regards to the grounds of appeal, the residential zoning objective, the established pattern of development in the area and the policy framework, it is considered that the proposed development would represent a reasonable improvement of accommodation on site, would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties including No.15 Castle Village Rise and as such would be consistent with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

## 11.0 Conditions

1. The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application on 19/11/2024, as revised by

further information received on 08/04/2025 and 13/05/2025, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions. Where such conditions require details to be agreed with the planning authority, the developer shall agree such details in writing with the planning authority prior to commencement of development and the development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the agreed particulars.

**Reason:** In the interest of clarity.

2. The developer shall amend the design of the proposed development to accord with the following:

(a) The rear-facing dormer structure shall be reduced by 0.5m in width to measure a maximum of 3.5m when measured externally.

(b) The dormer structure shall be set down a minimum 0.3m from the existing ridge of the dwelling

**Reason:** In the interests of visual amenities

3. Details of the materials, colours, and textures of all the external finishes to the dormer shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing with, the planning authority prior to commencement of development.

**Reason:** In the interest of visual amenity

4. Site development and building works shall be carried out only between the hours of 0700 to 1800 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between 0800 to 1400 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and public holidays. Deviation

from these times will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where prior written approval has been received from the planning authority.

**Reason:** In order to safeguard the amenities of property in the vicinity.

5. Water supply and drainage arrangements including the attenuation and disposal of surface water, shall comply with the requirements of the planning authority for such works and services.

**Reason:** In the interest of public health and surface water management.

6. Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall enter into a water and wastewater connection agreement with Irish Water.

**Reason:** In the interests of public health

7. All necessary measures be taken by the contractor to prevent the spillage or deposit of clay, rubble, or other debris on adjoining roads during the course of the works.

**Reason:** To protect the amenities of the area

8. The developer shall pay to the planning authority a financial contribution in respect of public infrastructure and facilities benefiting development in the area of the planning authority that is provided or intended to be provided by or on behalf of the authority in accordance with the terms of the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended. The contribution shall be paid prior to commencement of development or in such phased payments as the planning authority may facilitate and shall be subject to any applicable indexation provisions of the Scheme at the time of payment. Details of the application of the terms of the Scheme shall be agreed between the planning authority and the developer or,

in default of such agreement, the matter shall be referred to An Bord Pleanála to determine the proper application of the terms of the Scheme.

**Reason:** It is a requirement of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended, that a condition requiring a contribution in accordance with the Development Contribution Scheme made under section 48 of the Act be applied to the permission.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence me, directly or indirectly, following my professional assessment and recommendation set out in my report in an improper or inappropriate way.

---

Ronan Murphy  
Planning Inspector

2 March 2026

## Appendix 1 - Form 1

### EIA Pre-Screening

[EIAR not submitted]

<b>An Bord Pleanála Case Reference</b>	<b>ACP-322949-25</b>		
<b>Proposed Development Summary</b>	Conversion of attic to a room with dormer extension and associated works.		
<b>Development Address</b>	16 Castle Village Rise, Celbridge, Co. Kildare		
<b>1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA?</b> <small>(that is involving construction works, demolition, or interventions in the natural surroundings)</small>		<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>No</b>	
<b>2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1 or Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>X</b>		Tick if relevant. No further action required
<b>3. Does the proposed development equal or exceed any relevant THRESHOLD set out in the relevant Class?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>		State the relevant threshold here for the Class of development.	EIA Mandatory EIAR required
<b>No</b>			Proceed to Q4
<b>4. Is the proposed development below the relevant threshold for the Class of development [sub-threshold development]?</b>			
<b>Yes</b>			Preliminary examination required (Form 2)

**5. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted?**

<b>No</b>	Tick/or leave blank	<b>Screening determination remains as above (Q1 to Q4)</b>
<b>Yes</b>	Tick/or leave blank	<b>Screening Determination required</b>

Inspector: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_